



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,330	03/24/2004	Akemi Kurumatani	009683-502	4023

21839 7590 07/10/2006

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/807,330	Applicant(s) KURUMATANI, AKEMI	
	Examiner Nathan Hillery	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/24/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 3/24/04.
2. Claims 1 – 16 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, and 14 are independent.

Priority

3. Applicant is advised of possible benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), wherein an application for patent filed in the United States may be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior application filed in a foreign country.
4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
5. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. Claim 5 recites the limitation "said data definition file of the first type" in 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2176

9. Regarding claim 6, the metes and bounds of “the data definition file” (line 5) and “a language of the data definition file” (lines 5 & 6) are unclear because there are so many different languages and data definition files claimed. It is unclear which “data definition file” and “language of data definition file” applicant is seeking to reference.

10. **Regarding claims 8, 12 and 15**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 5, and are rejected along the same rationale.

11. **Regarding claims 9, 13 and 16**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 6, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

13. Claims 1 – 4, 7, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Ecolore (glossares.xml source code, glossaries.xml, glossaries_en.xml source code, glossaries.xml?lang=en, glossaries_el.xml source code, and glossaries.xml?lang=el).

14. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Ecolore illustrates, via files glossaries_en.xml and glossaries_el.xml, **a first memory storing a plurality of data definition files of a first type defining contents of data to be displayed**

Art Unit: 2176

on said client computer. It should be noted that files glossaries_en.xml and glossaries_el.xml are equivalent to the claimed **plurality of data definition files.**

The contents of these files are displayed to the client via

ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml?lang=en, which specifies that

ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml be displayed with the content

defined in glossaries_en.xml as evidenced by its source code (Bottom of p 3 – middle of p 4).

15. Ecolore illustrates, via file glossaries.xml, **a second memory storing a data definition file defining, as data, file names of said data definition files of the first type.** It should be noted that file glossaries.xml is equivalent to the claimed **data definition file defining, as data, file names of said data definition files of the first type**, since glossaries.xml defines, as data, file names of the data definition files of the first type, specifically glossaries_en.xml and glossaries.xml?lang=el, as illustrated on p 2 of glossaries.xml.

16. Ecolore teaches that the html document was generated from XML using XSLT (source code of glossaries.xml, p 1, line 3) and that the user can choose a language via one of the links (glossaries.xml), which is equivalent to the claimed **a third memory storing a style definition file, defining a style for displaying said data definition file, and switching a file to be displayed among said plurality of data definition files of the first type by using said data definition file of the second type.** It should be noted that the XSLT is equivalent to the claimed **style definition file**, and the user's choice of language by clicking one of

Art Unit: 2176

the links (el or en) in the glossaries.xml page is equivalent to the claimed

switching a file to be displayed.

17. Ecolore illustrates **a display displaying data on the client computer using the files stored in said first, second and third memories**, since the data that is displayed to the client is the webpage of glossaries.xml?lang=en, which is glossaries.xml with the content of glossaries_en.xml rendered by an XSLT. This data is displayed when a client accesses the glossaries.xml page and chooses English as his/her language of preference (ecolore.leeds.ac.uk/xml/links/glossaries.xml?lang=en).

18. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Ecolore teaches that the html document was generated from XML using XSLT (source code of glossaries.xml, p 1, line 3), which is equivalent to the claimed **display language is switched by switching a file used for display by said style definition file.**

19. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Ecolore illustrates in the top left hand corner of glossaries.xml webpage that **by using said data definition file of the second type in said client computer, a menu for selecting a file used for display is displayed**, since glossaries.xml is equivalent to the claimed **data definition file of the second type.**

20. Ecolore teaches that when a user makes a selection via the drop down menu the appropriate page, glossaries.xml?lang=en for example, is displayed (glossaries.xml source code, p 2), which is equivalent to the claimed **by**

Art Unit: 2176

receiving a user's selection through said menu, the file used for display is switched.

21. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Ecolore teaches that the html document was generated from XML using XSLT (source code of glossaries.xml, p 1, line 3), which is equivalent to the claimed **said data definition file is XML and said style definition file is XSLT**.

22. **Regarding claims 7, 10, 11 and 14**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1 – 4, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ecolore (glossares.xml source code, glossaries.xml, glossaries_en.xml source code, glossaries.xml?lang=en, glossaries_el.xml source code, and glossaries.xml?lang=el) as applied to claims 1 – 4, 7, 10, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of Bravery et al. (20030037076).

Art Unit: 2176

25. **Regarding dependent claim 5, Ecolore does not explicitly teach that a fourth memory storing a data definition file of a third type defining a portion to be displayed among contents of the data of said data definition file of the first type; wherein said display displays data in said client computer by using files stored in said first, second, third and fourth memories.**

26. Bravery et al. teach that XSL is a language for expressing style sheets which describe presentation characteristics such as which data fields of an XML file are to be displayed, where they are to be displayed on the page, and how to display them (paragraph block 0005), which is equivalent tot the claimed **a fourth memory storing a data definition file of a third type defining a portion to be displayed among contents of the data of said data definition file of the first type.**

27. Bravery et al. teach that a presentation markup file built for each page and for each distinct markup language. This file defines how the page will look in a given markup language for a class of display device (paragraph block 0042), which is equivalent to the claimed **wherein said display displays data in said client computer by using files stored in said first, second, third and fourth memories**

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ecolore with that of bravery et al. because such a combination would provide the readers of Ecolore with a method

Art Unit: 2176

of generating device-type-specific XSLT style sheets from relatively simple page layout files or 'presentation skeleton' files (paragraph block 0010).

29. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Ecolore does not explicitly teach that **said data definition file of the third type describes device information and each of said plurality of data definition files of the first type has same structure, holds the device information as tag attribute, and has a description corresponding to a characteristic of the data definition file including a description corresponding to a language of the data definition file.**

30. Bravery et al. teach a presentation markup file built for each page and for each distinct markup language. This file defines how the page will look in a given markup language for a class of display device (paragraph block 0042), which is equivalent to the claimed **said data definition file of the third type describes device information.**

31. Bravery et al. teach that in a presentation skeleton, some of the presentation markup required to define the desired presentation characteristics for a particular Web page, markup language and device class has been substituted by XSLT statements or special purpose XML tags that reference components. The markup within a presentation skeleton largely comprises the subset of presentation markup which is unique to a particular page and the component reference tags and XSLT statements are used to reference the subset of presentation characteristics which are shared across many pages as

Art Unit: 2176

well as the incorporation of dynamic data from a back-end system (paragraph block 0042), which is equivalent to the claimed **each of said plurality of data definition files of the first type has same structure, holds the device information as tag attribute, and has a description corresponding to a characteristic of the data definition file including a description corresponding to a language of the data definition file.**

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Ecolore with that of bravery et al. because such a combination would provide the readers of Ecolore with a method of generating device-type-specific XSLT style sheets from relatively simple page layout files or 'presentation skeleton' files (paragraph block 0010).

33. **Regarding claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 16**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 5 and 6, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

Art Unit: 2176

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Doug Hutton', with a stylized, looping flourish at the end.

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176

NH